

Remarks

In the Office Action of January 27, 2003, the election of Group I, claims 1-36, was acknowledged. As set forth in the response to the restriction requirement, Applicant's believed that a set of claims numbered 103-110 was pending in the application. Examination of that set of claims was desired, although claims 1-36 were elected. The Examiner indicated that claims 103-110 were not pending in the application, and accepted the election of claims 1-36. Accordingly, the present amendment is directed to adding the desired claims as claims 79-86 according to the Examiner's claim numbering suggestion, and canceling all other claims.

In the Office Action of January 27, 2003 the Examiner requested that the status of the parent file of the present case be updated. The specification has been amended to update the status of the parent case.

In the Office Action of January 27, 2003 claims 1-36 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-36 of co-pending Application No. 09/912,471. Claims 1-36 have been canceled.

In the Office Action of January 27, 2003 claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b), or in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as anticipated by, or obvious over, EP 0 380 343. Claims 1-36 have been canceled.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 79-86.

Respectfully submitted,

WONG ET AL.

April 8, 2003

By: 

Richard Taylor
Patent Counsel
Solae, LLC
(314) 982-3004

Reg. No. 37,248